Training Strategic Level Working Group Developer Subcommittee

Meeting Notes June 23, 2004

Meeting Date	June 23, 2004			
	12-12:45 pm			
Attendees:	Chair: Jim Harrison, UPMC			
	Participants:			
	Dave Kane-NCI, SRA			
	NCI: Lynette Grouse, Leslie Derr, Marsha Reichman Ph.D.			
	Booz Allen: Cait Cusack, Arumani Manisundaram, Anureet Deu			
Agenda	Open Meeting			
	Best Practices Architecture Group			
	caBIG Compatibility Document			
	Other Issues and Concerns			
	Confirm next meeting			
1. Best Practices	 Discussed reasons behind considering combining the Training 			
Architecture Group	Developers Subcommittee with the Architecture Best Practices Group.			
1	 Both groups need to identify common documentation which will 			
	then aid in the standardization of training materials			
	 The Best Practices Architecture Group has liaisons to other 			
	groups and combining these two groups may be more efficient			
	 Piggybacking interactions between the two groups would help 			
	to avoid duplication of efforts			
	 We have already identified common goals and efforts between 			
	the two groups			
	The hope had been to explain this reasoning at the meeting today, but			
	due to the lack of participation will instead plan to send out an email to			
	the group			
	 Discussion around the large diversification between developers and the 			
	need for the creation of standardization for these diverse groups			
	internal documentation			
	Arumani Manisundaram gave a brief update on planned activities going			
	forward			
	 Presentation June 24 on a potential grid prototype 			

Training Strategic Level Working Group Developer Subcommittee

Meeting Notes June 23, 2004

	o Release	Release of white paper			
		te paper, compatibility document and presentation are			
		sible from the caBIG website			
		Suggestion was made to have an annotated Page with a			
		list of references, brief annotations, and links to these			
		types of documents. This suggestion will be raised with			
		the appropriate individuals			
	-	on was raised about the progress of the needs			
		ent being done by the Architecture group.			
		There are assessments being carried out by the domain			
		workspaces.			
		The needs assessment for developers could not move			
		forward until it was defined what it means to be caBIG			
		It is recognized that it would help the developers to			
		know what technology they have access to before they			
		can assess needs. The compatibility document and white paper should help in determining this.			
		ical Trials Group has a SIG, which is taking the			
		bility document and creating a scorecard against which			
		rials applications can be measured to help in			
		ning what level of compatibility the programs are			
		y operating under.			
2. caBIG •		s raised regarding the lack of a complete definition for			
Compatibility	Gold Level the timeframe for determining this definition				
Document		g input from the caBIG community			
Document		g process-as stated this is a Living Document			
	o The goal	would be to have this better defined in 3-6 months			
3. Other issues and	There was a disc	ussion that there are others who will want to participate			
concerns	in the grid	1 1			
•	-	rest by commercial vendors was raised			
	o Advise o	commercial vendors to monitor the forums and watch			
	the prog				
	-	n source issue is of concern to commercial vendors			
		One can be caBIG compatible without being open source			
	•	Funded development must be open source			

Training Strategic Level Working Group Developer Subcommittee

Meeting Notes June 23, 2004

4. Confirm next • Next meeting is meeting	s scheduled for July 7, (04 at noon	
Cait Cusack and Jim Harrison	Create email for the Best Practices Group inviting them to join with this group and the reasoning behind this thought	June 30, 04	
Cait Cusack	Consult with website administrators to determine feasibility of creating annotated documentation page	June 30, 04	